UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,874	07/07/2004	Serge Haumont	60091.00329	1172
	7590 08/31/200 DERS & DEMPSEY L	EXAMINER		
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			BRANDT, CHRISTOPHER M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/31/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/500,874	HAUMONT, SERGE		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CHRISTOPHER M. BRANDT	2617		

	CHRISTOPHER M. BRANDT	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original for replacements or repla	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the proposed in the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims.</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ul> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:</li> </ul>	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will	•	-
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/George Eng/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617	/Christopher M Brandt/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617		

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

Continuation of 11. The examiner maintains his position / rejection in the Final Office Action dated May 18, 2009. With regard to applicant's argument that the combination of Stille and Anderson fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, "selecting, in the network apparatus, the gateway network node of the home network if the mobile station is in a predefined partner network of the home network," the examiner respectfully disagrees. As indicated in the previous communication Anderson teaches classifying service providers such as home service provider, partner service provider and then selects the best service provider (column 3 lines 40-43, 53-65). The examiner notes that if a selection is made using the best service provider, a node has to be selected in order to provide the mobile station with service. Furthermore, in a previous communication, the examiner indicated that Stille teaches this feature / condition in paragraph 30 when Stille teaches that two of the MTs: 2, 3 are subscribed to operator A and operator B, respectively. The HLR:s 10, 11 are contacted and inform the SGSN 9 that the subscribers may use the APS:s 12, 13 that are chosen. Therefore, Stille discloses the limitation, "selecting the gateway network node of the home network if the mobile station is in a predefined partner network of the home network." However, as the examiner previously indicated, Anderson was relied upon to further clarify this particular feature in order to advance prosecution. Therefore, the combination of Stille and Anderson does disclose "selecting, in the network apparatus, the gateway network node of the home network if the mobile station is in a predefined partner network."

With regard to applicant's argument that it would not be obvious to combine the solutions of Anderson to the solution of Stille, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Anderson and Still are both concerned with selecting / locking on to a preferred network (Stille; paragraph 11, Anderson; column 5 lines 55-67) and show and disclose the claims as currently written.

Chris Brandt Art Unit 2617 08/28/2009